REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-8, 14, 16-20, 49, 51-57, 60-64, 98, 100-104 are currently pending.

Claims 1, 4, 14, 49, 52, 57, 60, 98 and 100 have been amended to recite that the training is cognitive training. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at page 2, lines 25-28; on page 3, lines 1-28, particularly lines 1, 9, 11, 18, and 23; page 12, lines 11-13; and elsewhere in the application as originally filed. No new matter is added by the claim amendments.

Claims 1, 4-8, 14, 16-20, 49, 51-57, 60-64, 98, 100-104 stand rejected in the present Office action. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

I. Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph (enablement)

The USPTO maintains rejection of claims 1, 4-8, 14, 6-20, 49, 51-57, 60-64, 98, 100-104 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph allegedly "because the specification, while being enabling...for specific phosphodiesterase inhibitors, does not reasonably provide enablement for all phosphodiesterase inhibitors". (Page 2 of the instant Office Action).

When making a rejection on the ground of alleged lack of enablement, the USPTO has the "initial burden of setting forth a reasonable explanation as to why [he/she] believes that the scope of protection provided by [the] claim is not adequately enabled by the description of the invention provided in the specification." In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Without a reason to doubt the truth of the statements made in the patent application, the application must be considered enabling. In re Wright, supra; In re Marzocchi, 439 F.2d 220, 223, 169 USPQ 367, 369 (CCPA 1971).

The test for enablement entails an analysis of whether one skilled in the art would have been able at the effective filing date to practice the invention using information disclosed in the application and information known in the art without undue or unreasonable experimentation

(MPEP § 2164.01; see In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ 2d 1400, [Fed. Cir. 1988]). A finding of lack of enablement and determination that undue experimentation is necessary requires an analysis of a variety of factors (i.e., the In re Wands factors). The most important factors that must be considered in this case include 1) the nature of the invention; 2) the level of ordinary skill in the art; 3) guidance provided in the specification; and 4) the state of the prior art. "[H]ow a teaching is set forth, by specific example or broad terminology, is not important"; and furthermore still, "limitations and examples in the specification do not generally limit what is covered by the claims" (MPEP § 2164.08). The determination of what constitutes undue experimentation in a given case requires the application of a standard of reasonableness, having due regard for the nature of the invention and the state of the art. Ansul Co. v. Uniroyal, Inc. 448 F.2d 872, 878 79; 169 USPQ 759, 762¬ 63 (2d Cir. 197 1), cert. denied, 404 U.S. 10 18, 30 L. Ed. 2d 666, 92 S. Ct. 680 (1972). The test is not merely quantitative, since a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if it is merely routine, or if the specification in question provides a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed. It is well settled that patent applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by their claims, even in an unpredictable art. The legal standard merely requires that there must be sufficient disclosure, either through illustrative examples or terminology, to teach those of ordinary skill how to make and use the invention as broadly as it is claimed. Enzo Biochem., Inc. v. Calgene, Inc., 188 F.3d 13 62 (Fed. Circ. 1999), at 1372 (quoting In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 496 (Fed. Cir. 1991)).

Proper application of the legal standard must lead to the conclusion that all claims pending in this application are fully enabled.

The present invention concerns a method of increasing performance gain during treatment of a cognitive deficit associated with a central nervous system disorder or condition in an animal in need of said treatment comprising the steps of:
(a) providing cognitive training said animal under conditions sufficient to produce an improvement in performance by said animal of a cognitive task whose deficit is associated with said central nervous system disorder or condition, and

(b) administering to said animal before, during or after cognitive training, a phosphodiesterase inhibitor which enhances CREB pathway function;

wherein a performance gain is achieved relative to the performance of said cognitive task achieved by training alone.

The specification teaches that this combination of training with a phosphodiesterase inhibitor can improve the efficiency of existing cognitive training protocols because the combination can reduce the number of training sessions required to yield a performance gain or by requiring shorter or no rest intervals between training sessions to yield a performance gain (see e.g. page 2, line 27 to page 3, line 3).

The USPTO states that the specification fails to provide support for all phosphodiesterase inhibitors. The specification is allegedly limited to only two phosphodiesterase inhibitors, rolipram and iso-buto-metho-xanthine. (Page 4 of the Office Action).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Various cognitive training protocols were known in the art. The specification at page 12, line 14 to page 14, line 7 provides a number of references listing such protocols. Therefore one skilled in the art would be able to conduct the cognitive training protocols.

Administration of agents is well known, and administration of phosphodiesterase inhibitors is well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Phosphodiesterase inhibitors are known in the art. The specification provides specific examples of phosphodiesterase inhibitors including rolipram and IBMX (page 18, lines 26-28). Phosphodiesterase inhibitors were well known in the art at the time the application was filed; for example, see Basic Neurochemistry, Part Three, section 22, ed. Seigel et al., Lippincott, Sixth Edition (1999), including, for example, Table 22-1, listing many known phosphodiesterase inhibitors. One skilled in the art could readily determine whether other phosphodiesterase inhibitors could be employed in the claimed methods.

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art, in possession of the teachings of the application and of the ordinary skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, would be able to practice the invention. Although the USPTO states that the Tully declaration merely sates the mechanism in which any augmenting agent which enhances CREB pathway function by inhibiting phosphodiesterase in combination with cognitive training would result in performance gain, Applicants submit that the declaration by Timothy Tully, PhD. provides evidence that the methods described in the application are enabled, and provides support for Applicants' contention that one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would know how to practice the invention without undue experimentation, and that the specification is indeed enabling.

One skilled in the art could readily test a phosphodiesterase inhibitor to determine whether it resulted in performance gain in training when compared to training in the absence of the phosphodiesterase inhibitor. As the USPTO knows, a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if it is merely routine, or if the specification in question provides a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed. Accordingly, there is adequate information provided in Applicants specification to enable one skilled in the art to perform the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that the claims recite a method of increasing performance gain during treatment of a cognitive deficit by administering all phosphodiesterase inhibitors during training. Thus, the claims are not broad in that the claimed subject matter is explicitly recited in the claims and limited to particular methods. Moreover, the specification, and in addition the literature cited therein, teach the method of increasing performance gain during treatment of a cognitive deficit by administering all phosphodiesterase inhibitors. These teachings, examples, methods and techniques enable one of ordinary skill in ways to practice the method of increasing performance gain during treatment of a cognitive deficit by administering all phosphodiesterase inhibitors.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims are enabled and that the rejections of claims 1, 4-8, 14, 16-20, 49, 51-57, 60-64, 98, 100-104 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement are overcome.

II. Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The USPTO maintains rejection of claims 1, 4-8, 14, 16-20, 49, 51-57, 60-64, 98, 100-104 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly for "being obvious over Christensen et al., (5,547,979) in view of the Merck Manual. (Page 6 of the instant Office Action).

This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

As the USPTO is aware there are three requirements to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the cited references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); M.P.E.P. § 2142; *Cf. Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999) Moreover, the prior art must suggest the specific modification that is necessary in order to arrive at the claimed invention. *Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp.*, 908 F.2d 931, 934, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 498 U.S. 920 (1990).

Second, the proposed modification of the prior art must have a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1209, 18 U.S.P.Q. 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1991), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 856 (1991); *In re Erlich*, 22 U.S.P.Q. 1463, 1466 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1992); *In re Dow Chem.*, 837 F.2d 469, 473, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 ("Both the suggestion and the expectation of success must be found in the prior art, not the applicant's disclosure.").

And third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Applicants submit that the prior art references in combination fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

The USPTO agrees that "Christensen et al., fail to disclose multiple training sessions sufficient to produce an improvement in…cognitive task" (Page 6 of the instant Office Action). However, the USPTO asserts that Christensen et al., teaches a "method of treating stroke". In addition, Christensen et al. states that their "invention relates to a method of inhibiting TNF production in an animal" (column 2, lines 63-64) and to the "prevention of certain TNF mediated disease states amenable thereto" (column 3, lines 1-2).

Applicants note that the present invention is not directed to a method of treating stroke, nor of inhibiting TNF production, nor of preventing TNF mediated disease states.

The USPTO states that the Merck Manual teaches training of patients suffering from stroke. However, the Merck Manual does not teach cognitive training enhancement by the use of phosphodiesterase inhibitors, nor does it teach treatment of stroke, but merely the sequelae of stroke. Applicants note that the section identified by the USPTO is headed "Rehabilitation and aftercare." The Merck Manual does not teach or suggest the administration of phosphodiesterase inhibitors before or during cognitive training. The Merck Manual does not does not teach or suggest that one could achieve performance gain during training by the administration of phosphodiesterase inhibitors before or during cognitive training.

The Merck Manual being directed to rehabilitation and aftercare, while Christensen is directed to the treatment to TNF mediated disease states, and not "rehabilitation and aftercare", there is no motivation or suggestion to combine these references in an attempt to provide the claimed invention. Christensen does not discuss or deal with rehabilitation or aftercare, while the cited section of the Merck Manual, which mentions a remedial program, is not directed to treating stroke. Thus, there is no motivation in the references, nor in the art itself, to combine these references.

Even if combined, they lack elements of the invention, and so do not make the present invention obvious. For example, Applicants have surprisingly found that the administration of a phosphodiesterase inhibitor before, during or after cognitive training results in a performance

gain by requiring shorter or no rest intervals between training sessions to yield a performance gain.

The combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest this element of the claimed invention. There is no teaching or suggestion in the combined references to administer a phosphodiesterase inhibitor before, during or after cognitive training. Thus, the combination of the cited references fails to make the present invention obvious.

Importantly, neither reference teaches cognitive training, and the combination of the references also lacks teaching or suggestion of cognitive training. Thus, in this way as well, the combination of the cited references fails to make the present invention obvious.

In summary, the claimed invention is directed to a method of increasing performance gain during treatment of a cognitive deficit associated with a central nervous system disorder or condition in an animal in need of said treatment comprising the steps of:
(a) providing cognitive training to said animal under conditions sufficient to produce an improvement in performance by said animal of a cognitive task whose deficit is associated with said central nervous system disorder or condition, and
(b) administering to said animal before, during or after cognitive training, a phosphodiesterase inhibitor which enhances CREB pathway function;

wherein a performance gain is achieved relative to the performance of said cognitive task achieved by training alone.

Applicants note that the present application teaches the use of phosphodiesterase inhibitor to enhance CREB pathway function during cognitive training which is important in cognitive rehabilition. The combined references do not teach or suggest cognitive training, nor administration of rolipram before, during or after cognitive training. The combined references do not teach or suggest phosphodiesterase inhibitors to enhance CREB pathway function, nor teach or suggest that one could achieve performance gain during cognitive training by the administration of phosphodiesterase inhibitors before or during or after cognitive training. The combined references fail to discuss CREB pathway function, or enhancement of CREB pathway

function; however, enhancement of CREB pathway function is required by the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants maintain that a combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Absent a teaching or suggestion in the references either alone or in combination to administer phosphodiesterase inhibitors before or during or after cognitive training, the claimed invention is not rendered obvious. Furthermore, one skilled in the art would not have a reasonable expectation of obtaining a performance gain by the administration of phosphodiesterase inhibitors before or during or after cognitive training as compared to training in the absence of phosphodiesterase inhibitors. In the absence of such a reasonable expectation of success, the invention is non-obvious.

In view of these reasons, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in prima facie condition for allowance, and an early action to that effect is respectfully solicited. Please direct any calls in connection with this application to the undersigned at the number provided below.

Please charge any additional fees, including additional fees for extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. **08-1641**, referencing Attorney's Docket No. **43373-0008**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 31, 2007

James A. Fox
Reg. No.: 38,455

HELLER EHRMAN LLP
Customer No.: 25213
275 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, California 94025
Telephone: 1.650.324.7000
Facsimile: 1.650.324.0638

SV 2312250 v1
10/31/07 9:54 AM (39740-0007)